

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/620,486	07/16/2003	Till Cramer	DT-6580	9074	
30377	7590 11/01/2005		EXAMINER		
DAVID TOREN, ESQ. ABELMAN FRAYNE & SCHWAB			SMITH, MA	TTHEW J	
666 THIRD AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK,	NY 10017-5621	3672	<del>-</del> -		

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		App	olication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/	620,486	CRAMER ET AL.				
		Exa	miner	Art Unit				
			thew J. Smith	3672				
The MA Period for Reply	ILING DATE of this commun	ication appears	on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address				
WHICHEVER - Extensions of time after SIX (6) MON - If NO period for re - Failure to reply will Any reply received	IS LONGER, FROM THE M e may be available under the provisions ITHS from the mailing date of this comm	IAILING DATE ( of 37 CFR 1.136(a). I nunication. atutory period will appl will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUNICAT in no event, however, may a reply to y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS the application to become ABAND	oe timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) Respons	sive to communication(s) file	ed on 26 Septem	aher 2005					
<u>'=</u> '								
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Cla		•	•	,				
·		dina in the annli	cation					
	Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-18 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) <u>15 and 18</u> is/are allowed.							
	1,3 and 11-14 is/are rejected	nd.						
	4-9, 16 and 17 is/are object		At					
6) Claim(s)	are subject to restric	ction and/or elec	tion requirement.					
Application Pape	rs							
9) The spec	ification is objected to by th	e Examiner.						
10) The draw	ring(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted	or b) □ objected to by t	he Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacen	nent drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is	required if the drawing(s) is	s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	).			
11)∐ The oath	or declaration is objected to	by the Examin	er. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
1.□ Ce	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
. 2.☐ Ce								
3.☐ Cd	ppies of the certified copies	of the priority de	cuments have been rec	eived in this National Stage				
ар	plication from the Internation	nal Bureau (PC	T Rule 17.2(a)).	•				
* See the at	tached detailed Office actio	n for a list of the	e certified copies not rec	eived.				
			•					
Attachment(s)								
<u> </u>	nces Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Sumn	nary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)			Paper No(s)/Ma	nil Date				
	losure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or	PTO/SB/08)		nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail			6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3672

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The "overlap from a small central zone up to an entire bore hole radius upon rotation of the concrete drill" is not supported by the specification or drawings. Since striking part 2 is clearly inside cutting part 1, the overlap cannot be from a small central zone to the perimeter of cutting part 1.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacDonell (1863928).

Art Unit: 3672

MacDonell discloses a concrete drill for a rotary and percussively driven machine comprising a cutting part 10 and a striking part 2 axially limited and displaceable relative to the cutting part; the cutting part 10 and the striking part 2 each have, at their facial surfaces, zones for working a bore hole surface; the respective facial surface work zones of the cutting part and the striking part radially overlapping, Fig. 4, upon rotation of the drill; the leading end of the cutting part 10 and the striking part 2 form a common mantle head surface at an axial intermediate position (Fig. 2); and the head end leading end has a space, note Fig. 4, in a transverse plane, configured segmental with a large surface area.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacDonell in view of Hjalsten et al. (3259403).

MacDonell discloses a concrete drill for a rotary and percussively driven machine comprising a cutting part 10 and a striking part 2 axially limited and displaceable relative to the cutting part; the cutting part 10 and the striking part 2 each have at their facial surfaces zones for working a bore hole surface, the respective facial surface work

Art Unit: 3672

zones of the cutting part and the striking part radially overlap, Fig. 4, upon rotation of the drill; and the cutting part 10 is spring-biased by a spring 6 that is axially biased against an insertion end but not a very wear-resistant material or a hand tool machine.

Hjalsten et al. present very wear resistant hard metal inserts 19 in a percussion drill.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hard materials, as presented by Hjalsten et al., in order to increase wear of the bit.

It would have been further obvious to use the device in a hand tool since it is well known to fabricate the structure of the MacDonell device in a scale for any size drilling machine.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15 and 18 are allowed.

Claims 4-9, 16, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

# Response to Arguments

Page 5

Upon further consideration, the examiner has withdrawn the objection to claim 2. The examiner contends applicants' striking part 2 does not extend to the outside diameter of cutting part 1. Thus this limitation is challenged under 112 first paragraph and not considered a structural limitation to claim 1. Ergo, amended claim 1 is anticipated by MacDonell since the structure, up to this challenged limitation, i.e., the striking part and the cutting part are disclosed. The examiner apologizes for not advancing prosecution.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-7034. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F, 9-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Bagnell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3672

MJS MJS 26 October 2005